Type-Driven Incremental Semantic Parsing with Polymorphism

Kai Zhao
Graduate Center
City University of New York
kzhao.hf@gmail.com

Liang Huang
Queens College
City University of New York
liang.huang.sh@gmail.com

arXiv:1411.5379v3 [cs.CL] 16 Dec 2014

Abstract

Semantic parsing has made significant progress, but most current semantic parsers are extremely slow (CKY-based) and rather primitive in representation. We introduce three new techniques to tackle these problems. First, we design the first linear-time incremental shift-reduce-style semantic parsing algorithm which is more efficient than conventional cubic-time bottom-up semantic parsers. Second, our parser, being type-driven instead of syntax-driven, uses type-checking to decide the direction of reduction, which eliminates the need for a syntactic grammar such as CCG. Third, to fully exploit the power of type-driven semantic parsing beyond simple types (such as entities and truth values), we borrow from programming language theory the concepts of subtype polymorphism and parametric polymorphism to enrich the type system in order to better guide the parsing. Our system learns very accurate parses in GEOQUERY, JOBS and ATIS domains.

1 Introduction

Most existing semantic parsing efforts employ a CKY-style bottom-up parsing strategy to generate a meaning representation in simply typed lambda calculus Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005); Lu and Ng (2011) or its variants Wong and Mooney (2007); Liang et al. (2011). Although these works led to fairly accurate semantic parsers, there are two major drawbacks: efficiency and expressiveness.

First, as many researches in syntactic parsing Nivre (2008); Zhang and Clark (2011) have shown, compared to cubic-time CKY-style parsing, incremental parsing can achieve comparable accuracies while being linear-time, which means orders of magnitude faster in practice. We therefore introduce the first incremental parsing algorithm for semantic parsing. More interestingly, unlike syntactic parsing, our incremental semantic parsing algorithm, being strictly **type-driven**, directly employs type checking to automatically determine the direction of function application on-the-fly, thus reducing the search space and eliminating the need for a syntactic grammar such as CCG which explicitly encodes the direction of function application.

However, to fully exploit the power of type-driven incremental parsing, we need a more sophisticated type system than simply typed lambda calculus. We argue that it is beneficial to incorporate an explicit subtype hierarchy, such that ambiguous terms can be grounded based on context in a more explicit and declarative fashion. Compare the following two phrases:

(1) the mayor of New York?

(2) the capital of New York?

If we know that *mayor* is a function from city to person, then the first New York can only be of type city; similarly knowing *capital* maps states to cities disambiguates the second New York to be of type state. This can not be done using a simple type system with just entities and booleans.

Now let us consider a more complex question which will be our running example in this paper:

(3) What is the capital of the largest state by area?

Since we know *capital* takes a state as input, we expect *the largest state by area* to return a state. But does *largest* always return a state type? Notice that it is polymorphic, for example, *largest city by population*, or *largest lake by perimeter*. So there is no unique type for *largest*: its return type should depend on the type of its first argument (*city*, *state*, or *lake*). This observation motivates us to introduce the powerful mechanism of parametric polymorphism from programming languages into the type system for natural language. For example, we can define the type of *largest* to be a template

$$\textbf{largest} : (\texttt{'a}\rightarrow\texttt{t})\rightarrow(\texttt{'a}\rightarrow\texttt{i})\rightarrow\texttt{'a}$$

where `'a` is a *type variable* that can match any type (for formal details see Section 3).

Just like in functional programming languages such as ML or Haskell, type variables can be bound to a real type (or a range of types) during function application, using the technique of type inference. In the above example, when *largest* is applied to *city*, we know that type variable `'a` is bound to type city (or its subtype), so that *largest* would eventually return a city.

We make the following contributions:

- We design a linear-time incremental semantic parsing algorithm (Section 2), which is much more efficient than the majority of existing semantic parsers that are cubic-time CKY-based.
- In line with classical Montague theory Heim and Kratzer (1998), our parser is type-driven parsing instead of syntax-driven as in CCG-based efforts Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005); Kwiatkowski et al. (2011); Krishnamurthy and Mitchell (2014) (Section 2.3).
- We introduce parametric polymorphism into natural language semantics (Section 3), along with proper treatment of subtype polymorphism, and implement Hindley-Milner style type inference (Pierce, 2005, Chap. 10) during parsing (Section 3.2).[1]
- We adapt the latent-variable max-violation perceptron training from machine translation Yu et al. (2013), which is a perfect fit for semantic parsing due to its huge search space (Section 4).

Experiments on GEOQUERY, JOBS and ATIS domains show close to state-of-the-art performances, and demonstrate the advantage of a powerful type system.

2 Type-Driven Incremental Parsing

We start with the simplest meaning representation (MR), *untyped lambda calculus*, and then introduce typing and the incremental parsing algorithm for it. Later in Section 3, we add subtyping and type polymorphism to enrich the system.

2.1 Meaning Representation with Types

The untyped MR for the running example is:

Q: What is the capital of the largest state by area?

MR: (**capital** (**argmax** **state** **size**))

Note the binary function $\textbf{argmax}(\cdot,\cdot)$ is a higher-order function that takes two other functions as input: the first argument is a "domain" function that defines the set to search for, and second argument is an "evaluation" function that returns a integer for an element in that domain. In other words

$$\textbf{argmax}(f,g) = \operatorname*{\textbf{argmax}}_{x:f(x)} g(x).$$

[1]There are three kinds of polymorphisms in programming languages: parametric (e.g., C++ templates), subtyping, and ad-hoc (e.g., operator overloading). See (Pierce, 2002, Chap. 15) for details.

step	action	stack after action	queue
0	-	ϕ	what ...
1–3	skip	ϕ	capital ...
4	$\text{sh}_{\text{capital}}$	**capital**:e→e	of ...
7	$\text{sh}_{\text{largest}}$	**capital**:e→e **argmax**:(e→t)→(e→i)→e	state ...
8	sh_{state}	**capital**:e→e **argmax**:(e→t)→(e→i)→e **state**:e→t	by ...
9	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	**capital**:e→e (**argmax state**):(e→i)→e	by ...
11	sh area	**capital**:e→e (**argmax state**):(e→i)→e **size**:e→i	?
12	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	**capital**:e→e (**argmax state size**):e	?
13	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	(**capital** (**argmax state size**)):e	?

(a) type-driven incremental parsing with simple types (entities e, truth values t, and integers i); see Section 2.

step	action	stack after action	queue	typing
0	-	ϕ	what...	
1–3	skip	ϕ	capital...	
4	$\text{sh}_{\text{capital}}$	**capital**:st→ct	of...	
7	$\text{sh}_{\text{largest}}$	**capital**:st→ct **argmax**:('a→t)→('a→i)→'a	state...	
8	sh_{state}	**capital**:st→ct **argmax**:('a→t)→('a→i)→'a **state**:st→t	by...	
9	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	**capital**:st→ct (**argmax state**):(st→i)→st	by...	binding: 'a = st
11	sh area	**capital**:st→ct (**argmax state**):(st→i)→st **size**:lo→i	?	
12	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	**capital**:st→ct (**argmax state size**):st	?	st <: lo ⇒ (lo→i) <: (st→i)
13	$\text{re}_{\curvearrowright}$	(**capital** (**argmax state size**)):ct	?	

(b) type-driven incremental parsing with subtyping (<:) and type polymorphism (e.g., type variable 'a); see Section 3.2.

Figure 1: Type-driven Incremental Semantic Parsing (TISP) with (a) simple types and (b) subtyping+polymorphism on the example question: "what is the capital of the largest state by area?". Steps 5–6 and 10 are skip actions and thus omitted. The stack and queue in each row are the results *after* each action.

The simply typed lambda calculus Heim and Kratzer (1998); Lu and Ng (2011) augments the system with types, including base types (entities e, truth values t, or numbers i), and function types (e.g., e→t). So function **capital** is of type e→e, **state** is of type e→t, and **size** is of type e→i. The **argmax** function is of type (e→t)→(e→i)→e.[2] The simply typed MR is now written as

$$(\textbf{capital}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{e} \quad (\textbf{argmax}:(\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t})\to(\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{i})\to\mathsf{e} \quad \textbf{state}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t} \quad \textbf{size}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{i}))).$$

2.2 Incremental Semantic Parsing: An Example

We use the above running example to explain our type-driven incremental semantic parsing algorithm. Figure 1 (a) illustrates the full derivation.

Similar to a standard shift-reduce parser, we maintain a *stack* and a *queue*. The queue contains words to be parsed, while the stack contains subexpressions of the final MR, where each subexpression is a valid typed lambda expression. At each step, the parser choose to **shift** or **reduce**, but unlike standard shift-reduce parser, there is also a third possible action, **skip**, which skips a semantically vacuous word (e.g., "the", "of", "is", etc.). For example, the first three words of the example question *"What is the ..."* are all skipped (**steps 1–3** in Figure 1 (a)).

The parser then **shifts** the next word, *"capital"*, from the queue to the stack. But unlike incremental syntactic parsing where the word itself is moved onto the stack, here we need to find a **grounded**

[2]Note that the type notation is always *curried*, i.e., we represent a binary function as a unary function that returns another unary function. Also the type notation is always *right-associative*, so (e→t)→((e→i)→e) is also written as (e→t)→(e→i)→e.

predicate in the GeoQuery domain for the current word. In this example we find the predicate:

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e}$$

and put it on the stack (**step 4**).

Next, words *"of the"* are skipped (steps 5–6). Then for word *"largest"*, we shift the predicate

$$\textbf{argmax} : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t}) \rightarrow (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e}$$

onto the stack (**step 7**), which becomes

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \quad \textbf{argmax} : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t}) \rightarrow (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e}.$$

At this step we have two expressions on the stack and we could attempt to reduce. But type checking fails because for left reduce, **argmax** expects an argument (its "domain" function) of type $(\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t})$ which is different from **capital**'s type $(\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e})$, so is the case for right reduce.

So we have to shift again. This time for word *"state"* we shift the predicate

$$\textbf{state} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t}$$

onto the stack, which becomes:

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \quad \textbf{argmax} : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t}) \rightarrow (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \quad \textbf{state} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t}.$$

2.3 Type-Driven Reduce

At this step we can finally perform a **reduce** action, since the top two expressions on the stack pass the type-checking for rightward function application (a partial application): **argmax** expects an $(\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{t})$ argument, which is exactly the type of **state**. So we conduct a right-reduce, applying **argmax** on **state**, and the resulting expression is:

$$(\textbf{argmax} \quad \textbf{state}) : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e}$$

while the stack becomes (**step 9**)

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \qquad (\textbf{argmax} \quad \textbf{state}) : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e}$$

Now if we want to continue reduction, it does not type check for either left or right reduction, so we have to shift again.

So we move on to shift the final word *"area"* with the grounded predicate in GeoQuery database:

$$\textbf{size} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}$$

and the stack becomes (**step 11**):

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \qquad (\textbf{argmax} \quad \textbf{state}) : (\mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}) \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \quad \textbf{size} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{i}.$$

Now apparently we can do a right reduce supported by type checking (**step 12**):

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{e} \rightarrow \mathsf{e} \qquad (\textbf{argmax} \quad \textbf{state} \quad \textbf{size}) : \mathsf{e}$$

followed by another, final, right reduce (**step 13**):

$$(\textbf{capital} \qquad (\textbf{argmax} \quad \textbf{state} \quad \textbf{size})) : \mathsf{e}.$$

Here we can see the novelty of our shift-reduce parser: its decisions are largely driven by the type system. When we attempt a reduce, **at most** one of the two reduce actions (left, right) is possible thanks to type checking, and when neither is allowed, we have to shift (or skip). This observation suggests



Figure 2: Type hierarchy for GEOQUERY domain (slightly simplified for presentation).

that our incremental parser is more deterministic than those syntactic incremental parsers whose each step always faces a three-way decision (shift, left-reduce, right-reduce). We also note that this type-checking mechanism, inspired by the classical type-driven theory in linguistics Heim and Kratzer (1998), eliminates the need for an *explicit* encoding of direction as in CCG, which makes our formalism much simpler than the synchronous syntactic-semantic ones in most other semantic parsing efforts Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005, 2007); Wong and Mooney (2007).

As a side note, besides function application, reduce also occurs when the top two expressions on the stack can be combined to represent a more specific meaning, which we call *union*.

For example, when parsing the phrase "major city", we have the top two expressions on the stack

$$\textbf{major}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t} \quad \textbf{city}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t}$$

We can combine the two expressions using predicate **and** since their types match, and get

$$\lambda x:\mathsf{e}\,.\,(\textbf{and}:\mathsf{t}\to\mathsf{t}\to\mathsf{t}\,(\textbf{major}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t}\;\;x)\;(\textbf{city}:\mathsf{e}\to\mathsf{t}\;\;x)),$$

where type $\mathsf{t}\to\mathsf{t}\to\mathsf{t}$ takes two booleans and return one (again, using currying notation).

3 Subtype and Type Polymorphisms

As mentioned in Section 1, simply typed lambda calculus representation can not distinguish between Mississippi the river and Mississippi the state since they both have the same type e. Furthermore, currently function **capital** can apply to any entity type, for example **capital**(**boston**), which should have been disallowed by the type checker. So we need a more sophisticated type system that helps ground terms to real-world entities, and this refined type system will in turn help type-driven parsing.

3.1 Augmenting MR with Subtyping

We first augment the meaning representation with a type hierarchy which is domain specific. For example Figure 2 shows a (slightly simplified) version of the type hierarchy for GEOQUERY domain. Here the root type top has a subtype of locations, lo, which consists of two different kinds of locations, administrative units (au) including states (st) and cities (ct), and nature units (nu) including rivers (rv) and lakes (lk). We use $<:$ to denote the (transitive, reflexive, and antisymmetric) **subtyping relation** between types; for example in GEOQUERY we have $\mathsf{st} <: \mathsf{lo}$, $\mathsf{rv} <: \mathsf{nu}$, and $\mathsf{T} <: \mathsf{top}$ for any type T.

In addition we have an integer type i derived from the root type top. The boolean type t does not belong to the type hierarchy, because it does not represent the semantics from the task domain.

Each constant in the GEOQUERY domain is well typed. For example, there are states (**mississippi**:st), cities (**boston**:ct), rivers (**mississippi**:rv), and lakes (**tahoe**:lk). Note that the names like *mississippi* appears twice for two different entities. The fact that we can distinguish them by type is a crucial advantage of a typed semantic formalism.

Similarly each predicate is also typed. For example, we can query the length of a river, **len**:rv→i, or the population of some administrative unit, **population**:au→i. Notice that **population**$(\cdot)$ can be applied to both states and cities, since they are subtypes of administrative unit, i.e., st $<:$ au and ct $<:$ au. This is because, as in Java and C++, a function that expects a type T argument can always take an argument of another type S which is a subtype of T. More formally:

$$\frac{e_2 : \mathsf{S} \qquad \mathsf{S} <: \mathsf{T}}{(\lambda x : \mathsf{T} \,.\, e_1) \;\; e_2 \rightarrow [x \mapsto e_2]e_1}, \tag{4}$$

where $[x \mapsto e_2]e_1$ means substituting all occurrences of variable x in expression e_1 with expression e_2. For example, we can query whether two locations are adjacent, using **next_to**:lo→(lo→t), and similarly the **next_to**$(\cdot, \cdot)$ function can be applied to two states, or to a river and a city, etc.

The above type system works smoothly for first-order functions (i.e., predicates taking atomic type arguments), but the situation with higher-order functions (i.e., predicates that take functions as input) is more involved. What is the type of **argmax**? One possibility is to define it to be as general as possible, as in the simply typed version (and many conventional semantic parsers):

$$\textbf{argmax} : (\mathsf{top}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}){\rightarrow}(\mathsf{top}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\mathsf{top}.$$

But this actually no longer works for our sophisticated type system for the following reason.

Intuitively, remember that **capital**:st→ct is now a function that takes a state as input, so the return type of **argmax** must be a state or its subtype, rather than top which is a supertype of st. But we can not simply replace top by st, since **argmax** can also be applied in other scenarios such as "the largest city" or "the longest river". In other words, **argmax** is a *polymorphic* function, and to assign a correct type for it we have to introduce *type variables* (widely used in functional programming languages such as Haskell and ML, and also in C++ templates). We define

$$\textbf{argmax} : (\texttt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}){\rightarrow}(\texttt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\texttt{'a}$$

where the type variable 'a is a place-holder for "any type".

Before we move on, there is an important consequence of polymorphism worth mentioning here. For the types of unary predicates such as **city**$(\cdot)$ and **state**$(\cdot)$ that *characterize* its argument, we define theirs argument types to be the required type, i.e., **city** : ct→t, and **state** : st→t. This might look a little weird since everything in the domain of those functions are always mapped to true; i.e., $f(x)$ is either undefined or true, and never false for such f's. This is different from classical simply-typed Montague semantics Heim and Kratzer (1998) which defines such predicates as type top→t so that **city**(**mississippi** : st) returns false. The reason for our design is, again, due to subtyping and polymorphism: **capital** takes a state type as input, so **argmax** must returns a state, and therefore its first argument, the **state** function, must have type st→t so that the matched type variable 'a will be bound to st. This more refined design will also help prune unnecessary argument matching using type checking.

3.2 Parsing with Subtype Polymorphism and Parametric Polymorphism

We modify the previous incremental parsing algorithm with simple types (Section 2) to accommodate subtyping and polymorphic types. Figure 1 (b) shows the derivation of the running example using the new parsing algorithm. Below we focus on the differences brought by the new algorithm.

In step 4, unlike **capital** : e→e, we shift the predicate

$$\textbf{capital} : \mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{ct}$$

and in step 7, we shift the polymorphic expression for *"largest"*

$$\textbf{argmax} : (\texttt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}){\rightarrow}(\texttt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\texttt{'a}$$

And after the shift in step 8, the stack becomes

$$\textbf{capital}:\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{ct} \quad \textbf{argmax}:(\,\mathtt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}){\rightarrow}(\,\mathtt{'a}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\,\mathtt{'a} \quad \textbf{state}:\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}$$

At **step 9**, in order to apply **argmax** onto **state** : st→t, we simply **bind** type variable 'a to type st, i.e.,

$$\textbf{argmax}:(\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}){\rightarrow}(\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\mathsf{st} \quad \textbf{state}:\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{t}$$

results in

$$(\textbf{argmax}\ \ \textbf{state}) : (\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\mathsf{st}$$

After the shift in **step 11**, the stack becomes:

$$\textbf{capital}:\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{ct} \quad (\textbf{argmax}\ \ \textbf{state}):(\mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}){\rightarrow}\mathsf{st} \quad \textbf{size}:\mathsf{lo}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}.$$

Can we still apply right reduce here? According to the subtyping rule (Eq. 4), we want

$$\mathsf{lo}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i} <: \mathsf{st}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{i}$$

to hold, knowing that st <: lo. Luckily, there is a rule about function types in type theory that exactly fits here:

$$\frac{\mathsf{A} <: \mathsf{B}}{\mathsf{B}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{C} <: \mathsf{A}{\rightarrow}\mathsf{C}} \tag{5}$$

which states the input side is reversed (contravariant). This might look counterintuitive at the first glance, but the intuition is that, it is safe to allow the function **size** of type lo→i to be used in the context where another type st→i is expected, since in that context the argument passed to **size** will be state type (st), which is a subtype of location type (lo) that **size** expects, which in turn will not surprise **size**. See the classical type theory textbook (Pierce, 2002, Chap. 15.2) for details. See Figure 1 (b) for the full derivation.

4 Training: Latent Variable Perceptron

We follow the Latent Variable Violation-Fixing Perceptron framework Huang et al. (2012); Yu et al. (2013) for the training.

4.1 Framework

The key challenge in the training is that, for each question, there might be many different unknown derivations that lead to its annotated MR, which is known as the *spurious ambiguity*. In our type-driven incremental semantic parsing task, the spurious ambiguity is caused by how the expression templates are chosen and grounded during the shift step, and the different reduce orders that lead to the same result. We treat this unknown information as latent variable.

More formally, we denote $D(x)$ to be the set of *all* partial and full parsing derivations for an input sentence x, and $mr(d)$ to be the MR yielded by a full derivation d. Then we define the sets of (partial and full) reference derivations as:

$$good_i(x,y) \triangleq \{d \in D(x) \mid |d| = i, \exists \text{full derivation } d' \text{ s.t.} \\ d \text{ is a prefix of } d', mr(d') = y\},$$

Those "bad" partial and full derivations that do not lead to the annotated MR can be defined as:

$$bad_i(x,y) \triangleq \{d \in D(x) \mid d \notin good_i(x,y), |d| = i\}.$$

At step i, the best reference partial derivation is

$$d_i^+(x,y) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \underset{d \in good_i(x,y)}{\mathbf{argmax}}\ \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}(x,d), \tag{6}$$

while the Viterbi partial derivation is

$$d_i^-(x,y) \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \underset{d \in bad_i(x,y)}{\mathbf{argmax}}\ \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}(x,d), \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbf{\Phi}(x,d)$ is the defined feature set for derivation d.

In practice, to compute Eq. 7 exactly is intractable, and we resort to beam search.

Following Yu et al. (2013), we then find the step i^* with the maximal score difference between the best reference partial derivation and the Viterbi partial derivation:

$$i^* \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \underset{i}{\mathbf{argmax}}\, \mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{\Delta\Phi}(x, d_i^+(x,y), d_i^-(x,y)),$$

and do update:

$$\mathbf{w} \leftarrow \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{\Delta\Phi}(x, d_{i^*}^+(x,y), d_{i^*}^-(x,y))$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta\Phi}(x,d,d') \stackrel{\Delta}{=} \mathbf{\Phi}(x,d) - \mathbf{\Phi}(x,d')$.

4.2 Forced Decoding

We use forced decoding to retrieve the reference derivations $good_i(x,y)$ for each question/MR pair (x,y) in Eq. 6.

Unlike syntactic incremental parsing, where the forced decoding can be done in polynomial time Goldberg et al. (2014), we do not have an algorithm designed for efficient forced decoding. We apply exponential-time brute-force search to calculate $good(x,y)$, during which we do pruning based on the predicate application orders.

However, this requires heavy computation we can not afford. In practice we choose *multi-pass* forced decoding. First we use brute-force search to decode, but with a time limit. Then we train a Perceptron using successfully decoded reference derivations, and use the trained Perceptron to decode the unfinished questions with a large beam. We then add the reference derivations newly discovered into the next step training.

5 Experiments

We implement our type-driven incremental semantic parser (TISP) using `Python`, and evaluate its performance of both speed and accuracy on GEOQUERY and JOBS datasets.

Our feature design is inspired by the very effective Word-Edge features in syntactic parsing Charniak and Johnson (2005) and MT He et al. (2008). From each parsing state, we collect atomic features including the types and the leftmost and rightmost words of the span of the top 3 MR expressions on the stack, the top 3 words on the queue, the grounded predicate names and the ID of the expression template used in the shift action.

To ease the overfitting problem caused by the feature sparsity, we assign different budgets to different kinds of features and only generate feature combinations within a budget limit. We get 84 combined feature templates in total.

For evaluation, we follow Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005) to use *precision* and *recall*, where

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\#\text{ of correctly parsed questions}}{\#\text{ of successfully parsed questions}},$$

and

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\#\text{ of correctly parsed questions}}{\#\text{ of questions}}.$$

System	GEOQUERY			JOBS			ATIS		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Z&C'05	**96.3**	79.3	87.0	**97.3**	79.3	87.4	-	-	-
Z&C'07	91.6	86.1	88.8	-	-	-	**85.8**	**84.6**	**85.2**
UBL	94.1	85.0	89.3	-	-	-	72.1	71.4	71.7
FUBL	88.6	88.6	88.6	-	-	-	82.8	82.8	82.8
TISP (simple type)	89.7	86.8	88.2	76.4	76.4	76.4	-	-	-
TISP	92.9	**88.9**	**90.9**	85.0	**85.0**	**85.0**	84.7	84.2	84.4
λ-WASP*	92.0	86.6	94.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 1: Performances (precision, recall, and F1) of various parsing algorithms on GEOQUERY, JOBS, and ATIS datasets. *: λ-WASP for GEOQUERY is trained on 792 examples.



Figure 3: Type hierarchy for JOBS domain (slightly simplified for presentation).

5.1 Evaluation on GEOQUERY Dataset

We first evaluate TISP on GEOQUERY dataset.

Following the scheme of Zettlemoyer and Collins (2007), we use the first 600 sentences of Geo880 as the training set and the rest 280 sentences as the testing set.

Note that we do not have a separate development set, due to the relatively small size of Geo880. So to find the best number of iterations to stop the training, we do a 10-fold cross-validation training over the training set, and choose to train 20 iterations and then evaluate.

We use two-pass forced decoding. In the initial brute-force pass we set the time limit to 1,200 seconds, and find the reference derivations for 530 of the total 600 training sentences, a coverage of $\sim 88\%$. In the second pass we set beam size to 16,384 and get 581 sentences covered ($\sim 97\%$).

In the training and evaluating time, we use a very small beam size of 16, which gives us very fast decoding. In serial mode, our parser takes $\sim$83s to decode the 280 sentences (2,147 words) in the testing set, which means $\sim$0.3s per sentence, or $\sim$0.04s per word.

We compare the our accuracy performance with existing methods in Table 1. Given that all other methods use CKY-style parsing, our method is well balanced between accuracy and speed.

In addition, to unveil the helpfulness of our type system, we train a parser with only simple types. (Table 1) In this setting, the predicates only have primitive types of location lo, integer i, and boolean t, while the constants still keep their types. It still has the type system, but it is weaker than the polymorphic one. Its accuracy is lower than the standard one, mostly caused by that the type system can not help pruning the wrong applications like

$$(\textbf{population}{:}\mathsf{au}{\to}\mathsf{i}\ \ \textbf{mississippi}{:}\mathsf{rv}).$$

5.2 Evaluations on JOBS and ATIS Datasets

The JOBS domain contains descriptions about required and desired qualifications of a job. The qualifications include programming language (la), years of experience (ye), diplomat degree (de), area of fields (ar), platform (pa), title of the job (ti), etc. We show a simplified version of the type hierarchy for JOBS in Figure 3.

Following the splitting scheme of Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005), we use 500 sentences as training set and 140 sentences as testing set.

Table 1 shows that our algorithm achieves significantly higher recall than existing method of Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005), although our precision is not as high as theirs. This is actually because our method parses a lot more questions in the dataset, as the column of the percentage of successfully parsed sentences suggests.

We also evaluate the performance of TISP on ATIS dataset as in Table 1. ATIS dataset contains more than 5,000 examples and is a lot larger than GEOQUERY and JOBS. Our method achieves comparable performance on this dataset. Due to space constraints, we do not show its type hierarchy here.

6 Related Work

Zettlemoyer and Collins (2005) introduce a type hierarchy to semantic parsing and parse with typed lambda calculus combined with CCG. However, simply introducing subtyped predicates without polymorphism will cause type checking failures in handling high-order functions, as shown in Section 3. Furthermore, our system, being type-driven, almost completely rely on the types of MR expressions to guide parsing (except for some simple POS tag triggers) while their system is heavily CCG-based and syntax-driven.

Kwiatkowski et al. (2013) use "on-the-fly" matching to fetch the most possible predicate in the dataset for some MR subexpression. The matching happens at the end of parsing, and is constrained by the type of the subexpression. We do matching and parsing jointly, both of which are constrained by the typing, and affect the typing, which is more similar to how human do semantic parsing, i.e., we parse part of the sentence and bind that part to some specific meaning, and continue parsing using grounded meaning.

Wong and Mooney (2007) also use type information to help reduce unnecessary tree joining in decoding. However, their types are static, while our type system is stronger so that we can infer type from polymorphism, which gives use better search quality in decoding.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

We have presented an incremental semantic parser that is guided by a powerful type system of subtyping and parametric polymorphism. This polymorphism greatly reduced the number of templates and effectively pruned search space during the parsing. Our parser is competitive with state-of-the-art accuracies, but, being linear-time, is orders of magnitude faster than CKY-based parsers in theory and in practice.

For future work, we would like to work on weakly supervised learning that learn from question-answer pairs instead of question-MR pairs, where the datasets are larger, and TISP should benefit more on such problems.

References

Charniak, E. and M. Johnson (2005, June). Coarse-to-fine n-best parsing and maxent discriminative reranking. In *Proceedings of ACL*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, pp. 173–180.

Goldberg, Y., F. Sartorio, and G. Satta (2014). A tabular method for dynamic oracles in transition-based parsing.

He, Z., Q. Liu, and S. Lin (2008, August). Improving statistical machine translation using lexicalized rule selection. In *Proceedings of COLING*, Manchester, UK, pp. 321–328.

Heim, I. and A. Kratzer (1998). *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Blackwell Publishing.

Huang, L., S. Fayong, and Y. Guo (2012). Structured perceptron with inexact search. In *Proceedings of NAACL*.

Krishnamurthy, J. and T. M. Mitchell (2014). Joint syntactic and semantic parsing with combinatory categorial grammar.

Kwiatkowski, T., E. Choi, Y. Artzi, and L. Zettlemoyer (2013). Scaling semantic parsers with on-the-fly ontology matching.

Kwiatkowski, T., L. Zettlemoyer, S. Goldwater, and M. Steedman (2011). Lexical generalization in ccg grammar induction for semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*, EMNLP '11.

Liang, P., M. I. Jordan, and D. Klein (2011). Learning dependency-based compositional semantics. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pp. 590–599.

Lu, W. and H. T. Ng (2011). A probabilistic forest-to-string model for language generation from typed lambda calculus expressions. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.

Nivre, J. (2008). Algorithms for deterministic incremental dependency parsing. *Computational Linguistics 34*(4), 513–553.

Pierce, B. (Ed.) (2005). *Advanced Topics in Types and Programming Languages*. MIT Press.

Pierce, B. C. (2002). *Types and Programming Languages*. MIT Press.

Wong, Y. W. and R. J. Mooney (2007). Learning synchronous grammars for semantic parsing with lambda calculus. In *Annual Meeting-Association for computational Linguistics*, Volume 45, pp. 960.

Yu, H., L. Huang, H. Mi, and K. Zhao (2013). Max-violation perceptron and forced decoding for scalable mt training. In *Proceedings of EMNLP 2013*.

Zettlemoyer, L. and M. Collins (2005). Learning to map sentences to logical form: Structured classification with probabilistic categorial grammars. In *Proceedings of UAI*.

Zettlemoyer, L. S. and M. Collins (2007). Online learning of relaxed ccg grammars for parsing to logical form. In *In Proceedings of EMNLP-CoNLL-2007*. Citeseer.

Zhang, Y. and S. Clark (2011). Shift-reduce ccg parsing. In *Proceedings of ACL*.